

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 were presented for examination, and claims 1-26 were rejected. In the current amendment, claims 7, 8, and 12 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the current amendment, claims 1-26 will be presently pending in this application, of which claims 1, 12, and 22 are independent. Applicant submits that pending claims 1-26 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicant urges the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

Specification Amendment

Applicant hereby amends the specification to correct typographical informalities in the detailed description. Applicant submits that the specification amendment is not directed to any art rejection. No new matter has been introduced.

Claim Amendments

Claims 7 and 8 are hereby amended to address informalities with regards to insufficient antecedent basis. Claims 7 and 8 as amended depend on and incorporate the patentable subject matter of dependent claim 6 instead of independent claim 1. Claim 12 has been amended to address the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection as discussed below. Support for the amended claims can be found on page 4, lines 17-25; Figure 2; and throughout the remainder of the specification. No new matter has been introduced. Applicant submits that the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101**I. Claims 12 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed towards non-statutory subject manner. Applicant traverses this rejection.

The Examiner rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claim is not tied to a technological art which would produce a concrete, useful and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicant submits that claim 12, as amended, is directed towards a method performed in an electronic device which has a practical application in the technological arts.

In light of the present amendment and for at least the aforementioned reasons, Applicant submits that claim 12 recites statutory subject matter. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**II. Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as Anticipated By Sakamaki**

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,658,410 to Sakamaki et al (“Sakamaki”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For ease of the discussion, summaries of the claimed invention and the Sakamaki reference are provided below.

A. Summary of Claimed Invention

The claimed invention is directed towards an automated reputation/trust service that may furnish reputation information to requesting parties. The reputation/trust service of the claimed invention enables reputation information to be accessible on-line via a computer or telecommunications network, and may be accessible via the Internet. In order to obtain

reputation information from the reputation/trust service, a client may be assessed a charge and may be required to provide remuneration.

The automated reputation/trust service may contain data of a party's reputation with respect to one or more traits. A party's reputation refers to the general estimation in which a person or thing is held by the public or other group, and may be specific to a character or trait that is ascribed to the term or thing. As such, the reputation information provided by the reputation/trust service contains information about what others may think or say about a party with respect to a trait. For example, the automated reputation/trust service may have reputation information including a party's reputation for accurately judging things, such as a reputation for judging restaurants or music. In another example, the reputation information may be related to business, and may include information regarding legal reputation, medical reputation, or timeliness reputation. In another example, the reputation information may include a reputation of the trustworthiness of a party.

B. Summary of Sakamaki

Sakamaki is directed towards a bulletin board system (BBS) for introducing one member of the bulletin board system to another member by searching member provided profiles. In Sakamaki, a user registers his/her personal information including profile information with the BBS. The personal information includes a name, password, gender and birth date, and the profile information includes an online id, gender, age, location, interests and comments (see J1 and J3, Fig. 1). As such, the profile information of the user is based on information from the user describing interests of and comments about himself or herself. The profile information of BBS users are made available for searching and introduction to other members of the BBS. Once another member's profile matches a search criteria desired by a user, the BBS facilitates communication and introduction between the members.

C. Patentability of Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for providing an automated reputation service for furnishing information regarding *reputations of parties relative to multiple traits*. A client is provided access to the reputation service via a communications network to furnish the information regarding a *reputation of a selected party relative to the given trait*.

Sakamaki does not disclose an automated reputation service providing *reputation of a selected party relative to the given trait*. Rather, as discussed above, Sakamaki is concerned with providing introductions between members of a bulletin board system by searching member provided profiles. In contrast to the claimed invention, the member profiles of Sakamaki do not include information of a *reputation of a selected party relative to the given trait*. Instead, the member profiles of Sakamaki include information of the member's interests and comments as provided by the member at registration. Therefore, Sakamaki fails to disclose an automated reputation service providing a *reputation of a selected party relative to the given trait*.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, Sakamaki fails to disclose an automated reputation service providing *reputation of a selected party relative to the given trait*. Claims 2-11 depend on and incorporate all the patentable limitations of independent claim 1. Thus, Sakamaki fails to detract from the patentability of claims 2-11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

D. Patentability of Independent Claim 12

Independent claim 12, as amended, is directed towards a method in an electronic device for providing a collection of *reputation data regarding at least one selected party*.

The method includes furnishing at least a portion of the reputation data to a client and accepting remuneration for furnishing the portion of reputation data to the client.

Sakamaki does not disclose a method for providing a collection of *reputation data regarding at least one selected party*. Rather, Sakamaki describes a collection of member profiles on a bulletin board system searchable by other members. In contrast to the claimed invention, the member profiles of Sakamaki do not include *reputation data regarding at least one selected party*. Instead, the member profiles of Sakamaki include information on the interests and comments of the member as described by the member. Therefore, Sakamaki fails to disclose a method for providing a collection of *reputation data regarding at least one selected party*.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, Sakamaki fails to a method for providing a collection of *reputation data regarding at least one selected party*. Claims 13-21 depend on and incorporate all the patentable limitations of independent claim 12 as amended. Thus, Sakamaki fails to detract from the patentability of claims 12-21. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the Examiner's rejection of claims 12-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

E. Patentability of Independent Claim 22

Independent claim 22 is directed towards a system having a collection of *reputation data regarding multiple parties*. The system includes an automated reputation service for accessing the collection of *reputation data* on behalf of clients to provide clients with data from the collection of *reputation data*.

Sakamaki does not disclose an automated reputation service for accessing a collection of *reputation data regarding multiple parties*. Rather, Sakamaki discusses a bulletin board base service for providing access to members' profiles by other members. The member

profiles of Sakamaki include information on the interests and comments of the member as described by the member. In contrast, the claimed invention includes an automated reputation service for accessing a collection of *reputation data regarding multiple parties*. Therefore, Sakamaki fails to disclose an automated reputation service for accessing a collection of *reputation data regarding multiple parties*.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, Sakamaki fails to disclose an automated reputation service for accessing a collection of *reputation data regarding multiple parties*. Claims 23-26 depend on and incorporate all the patentable limitations of independent claim 22. Thus, Sakamaki fails to detract from the patentability of claims 23-27. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the Examiner's rejection of claims 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102.


CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks set forth above, Applicant contends each of the presently pending claims in this application is in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance.

If the Examiner deems there are any remaining issues, we invite the Examiner to call the Applicant's Attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP

Dated: February 11, 2005

By 
Christopher J. McKenna
Registration No.: 53,302
Attorney For Applicant

Lahive & Cockfield, LLP
28 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)